

As to the requirement for restriction to one of the inventions identified as invention I - claims 1-17, drawn to a reflection-type liquid crystal display device, classified in class 349, subclass 113, and invention II - claims 18-24, drawn to a process for producing a reflection-type liquid crystal device, classified in class 349, subclass 187, such requirement is traversed as being improper in relation to the claims, as amended.

In setting forth the requirements for showing distinctness, the Examiner indicates that inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made, referring to the requirements of MPEP §806.05(f) which are in terms of the process as claimed or the product as claimed. The Examiner contends that the instant case, product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process with the Examiner indicating that, for example, the step of exposing mixture to light, thereby photolithography forming a light reflector layer of a desired pattern does not need to be employed. At the outset, applicants submit that the Examiner has no factual basis to indicate what features need be employed or need not be employed. However, by the present amendment, claim 18 of invention II has been amended to delete the recitation of "heating the mixture to light, thereby photolithographically" forming a light reflector layer of "desired pattern" such that claim 18 of invention II now

recites the step of "forming a light reflector layer of the mixture" which is coextensive with the features of claim 1 of invention I. Applicants submit that the product as claimed in claim 1 of invention I can not be made by another and materially different process as claimed in claim 18 of invention II. Furthermore, claim 18 has been amended to delete the feature of "heating the light reflector layer under a predetermined temperature condition", such that the feature of precipitating fine silver particles on the surface of the light reflector layer of claim 18 of invention II is also now coextensive with the features of claim 1 of invention I. For these reasons, applicants submit that a showing of distinctness in accordance with MPEP §806.05(f) can not be properly presented with respect to the amended claims, and applicants request withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

In order to provide a complete response to the restriction requirement, applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, invention I including claims 1-17.

It is noted that the Examiner has required that if applicant elected the Group I, the application would contain claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention identified as (1) a color filter is provided between the light reflector section and the liquid crystal layer [claim 5; Fig. 4]; and (2) a color filter is provided between the substrate confronted with the substrate

with the light reflector section as formed thereon and the liquid crystal layer [claim 6; Fig. 5]; with the Examiner requiring election of a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims should be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The Examiner indicates that currently, claim 1 appears to be generic, and as recognized by the Examiner, upon allowance of claim 1, all claims dependent thereon would be considered allowable irrespective of whether or not such claims are directed to different species. Applicants submit that since claim 1 has not been rejected, claim 1 appears to be allowable and the requirement for election of species should be withdrawn.

In order to provide a complete response to the election requirement, applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, species (2) with claims 1-4 and 6-17 being readable thereon.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants request withdrawal of the restriction and election requirements, and favorable action with respect to all claims present in this application.

To the extent necessary, applicant's petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account

No. 01-2135 (500.37406X00) and please credit any excess fees
to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Melvin Kraus', written over a horizontal line.

Melvin Kraus

Registration No. 22,466

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

MK/cee
(703) 312-6600

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend claim 18 as follows:

18. (amended) A process for producing a reflection-type liquid crystal display device, which comprises steps of:

applying a mixture containing monovalent silver and a photosensitive polymeric medium to a substrate;

~~exposing the mixture to light, thereby~~
~~photolithographically forming a light reflector layer of~~
~~desired pattern the mixture;~~

~~heating the light reflector layer under a predetermined~~
~~temperature condition, thereby precipitating fine silver~~
particles on the surface of the light reflector layer; and

confronting a transparent substrate with said substrate on which the light reflector layer is formed, and sandwiching a liquid crystal layer between the substrates.

Please add the following new claim:

--29. A process according to claim 18, wherein the step of forming a light reflector layer of the mixture includes exposing the mixture to light, thereby photolithographically forming the light reflector layer of a desired pattern, and the step of precipitating fine silver particles on the surface of the light reflector layer includes heating the light

reflector layer under a predetermined temperature condition,
thereby precipitating the fine silver particles on the surface
of the light reflector layer.--